

Exact results for Casimir forces using Surface Impedance: Nonlocal Media

R. Esquivel,^{1,*} C. Villarreal,¹ and W. L. Mochán²

¹*Instituto de Física, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,
Apartado Postal 20-364, D.F. 01000, México*

²*Centro de Ciencias Físicas, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México,
Av. Universidad S/N, Cuernavaca, Morelos 62210,, México*

(Dated: February 1, 2008)

Abstract

We show that exact results are obtained for the calculation of Casimir forces between arbitrary materials using the concept of surface impedances, obtaining in a trivial way the force in the limit of perfect conductors and also Lifshitz formula in the limit of semi-infinite media. As an example we present a full and rigorous calculation of the Casimir force between two metallic half-spaces described by a hydrodynamic nonlocal dielectric response.

In recent years experimental studies of Casimir vacuum forces between metallic surfaces have reached the necessary accuracy to test in detail the theoretical predictions [1, 2, 3, 4] posed originally by Casimir in 1948 for perfectly-conducting parallel plates [5]. Indeed, the accuracy reached in the experiments has forced to consider detailed properties of the materials such as absorptivity, rugosity, or finite temperature effects [6, 7, 8]. The study of vacuum forces between realistic materials was pioneered by Lifshitz in 1956, who proposed a macroscopic theory for semi-infinite slabs described by a dielectric function $\epsilon(\omega)$ [10]. Lifshitz formula, which reduces to the Casimir result in the limiting case of perfect conductors, has been successfully employed in a number of experimental situations. Different authors have elaborated alternative derivations of Lifshitz formula that permit a simpler, more transparent approach to vacuum forces in realistic materials [11]. Among several proposals to calculate the Casimir force the impedance approach was employed for the first time by Mostepanenko and Trunov [9] to derive the Lifshitz formula in an approximate fashion. In a series of investigations of vacuum forces in realistic materials, both at zero and finite temperature, Klimchitskaya [14] et al. have found small discrepancies in the spatial behaviour of the forces when calculated according to the impedance or the Lifshitz approach. In those papers it is argued that the discrepancies arise from the approximate nature of the impedance concept. Indeed, within the particular context of the optics of metals, the surface impedance is usually derived by taking approximations valid only for good conductors below their plasma frequency, and it is interpreted in terms of induced surface currents [15]. However, such approximations are unnecessary and the concept of surface impedance can be straightforwardly applied to arbitrary materials [16, 17, 18]. In an equivalent framework, Kats [12] introduced the reflection amplitude coefficients r_a^α ($\alpha = s, p$) for metallic media to derive also an approximate version of Lifshitz formula to study the influence of nonlocality on van der Waals interactions in a semi-quantitative way. Noticeably, he stated incorrectly that the reflection coefficient cannot be expressed merely in terms of the surface impedance for dielectrics. Recently, a more rigorous derivation of the Casimir force in terms of the reflection amplitudes was discussed by Reynaud and collaborators [13] using a S -matrix formalism.

The surface impedance Z is *defined* as the ratio of the complex electric and magnetic field components in the direction parallel to the surface of incidence of an electromagnetic wave, evaluated just inside the surface [16, 17]. For an s -polarized wave incident on a planar

surface $z = z_0$ moving (at an angle θ) towards the positive z direction, the impedance boundary condition is

$$\mathbf{E}(z_0^-) = Z^s(\mathbf{H}_t(z_0^-) \times \hat{\mathbf{z}}), \quad (1)$$

while for a p -polarized wave, the corresponding definition is

$$Z^p \mathbf{H}(z_0^-) = \hat{\mathbf{z}} \times \mathbf{E}_t(z_0^-), \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ is a normal vector pointing inside the surface, and z_0^- denotes a position immediately before the $z = z_0$ interface. A main advantage of this concept is that it relates only external tangential fields, without the need of involving the internal degrees of freedom of electromagnetic field inside the material. Equations (1) and (2) are functional definitions of the surface impedance, so that they are *exact* and valid, not only for perfect conductors, but also for real metals and insulators. Indeed, from these definitions the reflection coefficients of the electromagnetic fields are obtained as

$$r_a^s = \frac{Z_a^s - Z_0^s}{Z_a^s + Z_0^s} \quad r_a^p = \frac{Z_0^p - Z_a^p}{Z_0^p + Z_a^p}, \quad (3)$$

with $Z_0^s = q/k_0$, and $Z_0^p = k_0/q$ and $Z_a^p = k_a c/(\epsilon_a \omega)$, $Z_a^s = \omega/k_a c$. These definitions in terms of the impedance are exact. For a local semi-infinite medium they yield the classical Fresnel coefficients [16].

$$r_a^s = \frac{k_0 - k_a}{k_0 + k_a} \quad r_a^p = \frac{\epsilon_a k_0 - k_a}{\epsilon_a k_0 + k_a}, \quad (4)$$

However, the surface impedances are more general, as they are also valid for spatially dispersive systems, for which the Fresnel relations are not applicable [17, 18].

In this paper we show that the use of Eqs.(1) and (2) yields exact results for the Casimir forces using an expression for the force valid for arbitrary materials. As a non-trivial application of the surface impedance approach we calculate the Casimir force between two semi-infinite slabs with a non-local dielectric response.

Consider two slabs $a = 1, 2$ parallel to the xy plane within free space and separated by a vacuum cavity V of length L along the z -direction, with inner boundaries at $z_1 = 0$ and $z_2 = L$ as shown in Fig.1. We assume that the slabs are non-chiral, translational invariant and isotropic within the xy plane, but otherwise they may be arbitrary. A given photon within V impinging upon a slab a may be reflected with a probability amplitude r_a^α which depends on its polarization α , acquiring a phase kL as it moves on to the other

slab. Otherwise, it may be transmitted into the material with a probability $T_a^\alpha = 1 - |r_a^\alpha|^2$ where it can be absorbed, exciting electronic or vibrational degrees of freedom, or it can be transmitted into the vacuum beneath the slab, in any case, becoming lost forever (multiple reflections within the slab are implicitly accounted for in the reflection amplitudes r_a^α). In thermodynamic equilibrium there would be photons coming from the outer vacuum and photons radiated by the materials themselves that would compensate exactly for the photons from v lost through absorption and transmission, appearing with a probability T_a^α with no definite phase relation to the lost photons. Thus, the equilibrium radiation within the cavity V depends exclusively on its geometry, characterized by L , and on reflection amplitudes r_a^α . Thus, we construct an auxiliary system S' made of two infinitesimal sheets at $z = z_a$, and we postulate that their reflection amplitudes are given exactly by the same amplitudes as those of the original slabs. This way, we assure that the radiation field within the fictitious cavity V' corresponds to the real one. We further assume that in S' a photon may be transmitted from V' into the vacuum outside with an amplitude t_a^α . By choosing $|r_a^\alpha|^2 + |t_a^\alpha|^2 = 1$ we make certain that energy is conserved without having to account for any internal degrees of freedom within the fictitious sheets.

We study first the case of s -polarized waves choosing $x - z$ as the plane of incidence. Then the incident electric field can be written as $\mathbf{E}(\mathbf{r}, t) = \mathbf{E}_0 e^{i(Qx - \omega t)} \phi(z)$, with amplitude $\mathbf{E}_0 = (0, E_y, 0)$, and the magnetic field $\mathbf{B} = (B_x, 0, B_z)$, is determined by Maxwell equations: $-iqB_x = \partial_z E_y$, and $qB_z = QE_y$, with wavevector $\mathbf{q}_\pm = (Q, 0, \pm k)$. The field component E_y satisfies a one-dimensional wave equation. The solution satisfying the boundary conditions at slab 1 interface ($z = 0^+$) is

$$E_y^<(z) = e^{-ikz} + r_1^s e^{ikz}, \quad (5)$$

while at slab 2 interface ($z = L^-$) we have

$$E_y^>(z) = e^{ik(z-L)} + r_2^s e^{-ik(z-L)}, \quad (6)$$

where the reflection amplitudes r_a^α are given by Eqs.(3).

The electric Green's function can now be calculated as

$$G_{k^2}^E(z, z') = \frac{E_y^<(z_<)E_y^>(z_>)}{W}, \quad (7)$$

where $z_<$ and $z_>$ are the smaller and larger of z and z' , respectively, and W is their Wronskian. The magnetic Green's function is obtained by replacing $E_y \rightarrow B_x$ and $r_a^s \rightarrow -r_a^s$ in

Eqs. (6)-(7). We do not consider B_z separately, as it is simply proportional to E_y . Therefore, for each $\underline{Q}$, the local density of states per unit k^2 is given by [19]

$$\rho_{k^2}^s(z) = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \text{Im} \left(G_{k^2}^E(z, z) + G_{k^2}^B(z, z) \right), \quad (8)$$

with $(\tilde{k} \equiv k + i0^+)$. By substituting Eqs. (7)-(6) and its magnetic analogues we obtain

$$\rho_{k^2}^s = \frac{1}{2\pi\tilde{k}} \text{Re} \left[\frac{1 + r_1^s r_2^s e^{2i\tilde{k}L}}{1 - r_1^s r_2^s e^{2i\tilde{k}L}} \right], \quad (9)$$

which is independent of z . Given the symmetries of the problem, the p -polarization density of states $\rho_{k^2}^p$ may be derived similarly, by just replacing $B_x \rightarrow -E_x$, and $E_y \rightarrow B_y$. The final expression is simply given by Eq.(9) after replacing all the superscripts $s \rightarrow p$. Finally, the total density of states is $\rho_{k^2} = \rho_{k^2}^s + \rho_{k^2}^p$.

Consider now a photon in a state characterized by α , $\mathbf{Q}$, and k^2 . Its momentum is $\pm\hbar k$ and it moves with velocity $\pm ck/q$ along the z direction, so that its contribution to the momentum flux is $\hbar ck^2/q$. Denoting by $f(k) = N_k + 1/2$ to photon occupation number of state k , the momentum flux from the vacuum gap into slab 2 is then given by

$$\sum_{\alpha} \int Q dQ dk^2 \hbar c \frac{k^2}{q} f(k) \rho_{k^2}^{\alpha}. \quad (10)$$

There is a similar contribution coming from the semi-infinite vacuum on the other side of the slab, obtained by substituting $r_2^{\alpha} \rightarrow 0$ above and reversing the flux direction $z \rightarrow -z$. The total force per unit area is obtained by subtracting the contributions from either side:

$$\frac{F(L)}{A} = \frac{\hbar c}{2\pi^2} \int_0^{\infty} dQ Q \int_{q \geq 0} dk \frac{\tilde{k}^3}{q} \text{Re} \frac{1}{k} \left[\frac{1}{\xi^s - 1} + \frac{1}{\xi^p - 1} \right], \quad (11)$$

with $\xi^{\alpha} = (r_1^{\alpha} r_2^{\alpha} \exp(2ikL))^{-1}$. The integral over k runs from iQ to 0 and then to ∞ , so that q remains real and positive. This expression depends only on the reflection coefficients or, equivalently, on the surface impedances of the system and the slab separation. Lifshitz formula is recovered upon substitution of the *local* Fresnel amplitudes Eqs.(4), whereas for perfect mirrors ($r_a^{\alpha} = \pm 1$) Eq.(11) yields the expected Casimir force.

An example of a non-trivial application of the impedance approach is the calculation of Casimir force between two conductors with a dielectric function that shows spatial dispersion. This is, $\epsilon(\vec{r} - \vec{r}', t - t')$, or in the Fourier space $\epsilon(\mathbf{q}, \omega)$. Kats [12] studied nonlocal

effects in an approximate way, and as he stated, it is necessary to specify correctly the dependence of the dielectric function on the wave vector. This is done in this section. In a conductor, the normal component of an incident p – *polarized* wave pushes the conduction charge towards or away of the surface creating an excess charge. When the frequency of the electromagnetic wave is greater than the plasma frequency ω_p of the metal, this charge accumulation propagates as a longitudinal wave (plasmon). Thus, at a surface, p – *polarized* waves couple to bulk plasmons taking away energy from the incident wave and changing the values of the reflection amplitudes at the surface. In this case the medium is said to be active and it supports both longitudinal and transverse oscillations. We have to distinguish between the longitudinal dielectric function $\epsilon(\mathbf{q}, \omega)_l$ describing the response to the longitudinal dielectric field $\mathbf{E}_{||}$ (parallel to the wave vector) and the transverse dielectric function $\epsilon(\mathbf{q}, \omega)_t$ that is the response to a transverse electric field. The total field is the sum of the longitudinal and transverse parts $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{E}_{||} + \mathbf{E}_{\perp}$. Thus, in the metal we have a p – *polarized* wave with wave vector $(Q, 0, k)$ satisfying $k^2 = \epsilon(\omega)_t \omega^2 / c^2 - k^2$ and a longitudinal wave with wavevector $\mathbf{l} = (Q, 0, l)$ that obeys the relation $\epsilon(\mathbf{l}, \omega)_l = 0$. Since s – *polarized* waves do not couple to plasmons the transverse dielectric function is local (no spatial dispersion). To describe the dielectric response of the metal we have a Drude transverse dielectric function $\epsilon_t = 1 - \omega_p^2 / (\omega(\omega + i\gamma))$, where ω_p is the plasma frequency and γ the damping. For the longitudinal part we consider a hydrodynamic dielectric function [24] given by

$$\epsilon^l(\vec{l}, \omega) = 1 - \frac{\omega_p^2}{\omega^2 + i\omega\gamma - \beta^2(Q^2 + l^2)}, \quad (12)$$

where $\beta^2 = 3v_f^2/5$ with v_f the Fermi velocity of the metal [24] and it enters the hydrodynamic model as a compressibility term of the charge carriers and it is responsible for the spatial dispersion [23].

The surface impedance for p – *polarized* waves can now be calculated at the surface of the metal. However, since we now have the additional longitudinal field, we need an additional boundary condition. For the problem we are considering this condition is that the normal component of the total current be zero at the surface. This is, $\vec{j}_{z\perp} + \vec{j}_{z||} = 0$. The surface impedance is calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} Z_p &= \frac{E_{x\perp} + E_{x||}}{B_y} \\ &= \frac{kc}{\epsilon_t \omega} + \frac{(\epsilon_t - 1)Q^2 c}{\epsilon_t l \omega}. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

This expression for the impedance is now used in Eq.(3) to obtain the reflectivity for p – *polarized* waves in the non-local case as

$$r_p = \frac{\epsilon_t k_0 - k - (\epsilon_t - 1)Q^2/l}{\epsilon_t k_0 + k + (\epsilon_t - 1)Q^2/l}, \quad (14)$$

while the reflectivity for the s – *polarized* waves is the local Fresnel coefficient r_s given in Eq.(4). In the local limit ($Im(l) \rightarrow 0$) the local Fresnel coefficient is recovered.

The Casimir force between two semi-infinite conductors described by the HD model can now be calculated again using Eq. (11). In Figure 3 we present the percent difference between the Casimir force for the local case (F_L) with that obtained with nonlocal effects (F_{NL}), i.e. $\Delta\% = |(F_{NL} - F_L)/F_L|100$. This is done for three different metals (K, Au, Al) as a function of the separation of the slabs in units of the plasma wavelength of the metal L/λ_p . The parameters for each metal (ω_p, γ, v_f) are taken from the literature [20, 25]. As expected the nonlocal effects become important for separations of the order of the plasma wavelength λ_p , and the difference between them can be significant for separations less than λ_p . For these separations the vacuum modes that contribute mainly to the Casimir force have a frequency larger than ω_p thus having propagating modes in the metals. Furthermore the better the conductor the higher the difference between the local and nonlocal cases.

The non-coincident results for the Casimir forces associated to the Lifshitz and the impedance approach Refs.[14] can be traced back to the introduction of an approximate expression for the impedance. In the original work of Mostepanenko and Trunov [9], they employed an expression for the impedance $Z(\omega) = 1/\sqrt{\epsilon(\omega)}$, valid only for small values of the electromagnetic wavevector $\mathbf{Q}$, parallel to the surface of incidence. However, by introducing the definitions (1) and (2) in the same formalism, then the *exact* expression for the Casimir force (Eq.(11)) is obtained by just replacing $Z \rightarrow Z^p$ in Eq.(41) of Ref.([14]), and $Z \rightarrow Z^s$ in Eq.(42) of the same reference.

In conclusion, we have shown that with the correct definitions of surface impedance an exact result for the Casimir force is obtained. As case studies we calculated the surface impedance and Casimir force between an homogeneous slab with a non-local optical response. In this case, we show that nonlocal effects become relevant for separations less than the plasma wavelength of the slab.

Acknowledgement: Partial support for this work was provided by DGAPA-UNAM Proyect 116002.

* Corresponding author. Email:raul@fisica.unam.mx

- [1] S. K. Lamoreaux, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 5 (1997).
- [2] U. Mohideen and Anushree Roy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 4549 (1998).
- [3] H. B. Chan, V. A. Aksyuk, R. N. Kliman, D. J. Bishop and F. Capasso, Science **291**, 1942 (2001).
- [4] B. W. Harris, F. Chen, and U. Mohideen, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 052109 (2000).
- [5] H. B. G. Casimir, Proc. Kon. Ned. Akad. Wet. **51**, 793 (1948).
- [6] M. Bordag, U. Mohideen, and V.M. Mostepanenko, Phys. Rep. **353**, 1 (2001).
- [7] M. Bordag, B.Geyer, G.L. Klimchitskaya, and V.M. Mostepanenko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 503 (2000); G.L. Klimchitskaya, and V.M. Mostepanenko, Phys. Rev. **63**, 062108 (2001);
- [8] M. Bostrom and B. E. Sernelius, Phys. Rev. B **61**, 2204 (2000); Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 4757 (2000).
- [9] V. M. Mostepanenko and N. N. Trunov, Sov. J. Nucl. Physics, **42**, 818 (1985).
- [10] E. M. Lifshitz, Sov. Phys. JETP **2**, 73 (1956).
- [11] N. G. Van Kampen, B. R. A. Nijboer, and K. Schram, Phys. Lett. **26A**, 307 (1968); D. Kupiszewska and J. Mostowski, Phys. Rev. A, **41**, 4636 (1990); D. Kupiszewska, Phys. Rev. A, **46**, 2286 (1992); R. Matloob, Phys. Rev. A, **60**, 50 (1999); R. Matloob, A. Keshavaraz, and D. Sedighi, Phys. Rev. A, **60**, 3410 (1999); R. Matloob and H. Falinejad, Phys. Rev. A, **64**, 042102 (2001).
- [12] E. I. Kats, Sov. Phys. JETP **46**, 109 (1977).
- [13] M. T. Jaekel and S. Reynaud, J. Phys. I France, **1**, 1395 (1991). C. Genet, A. Lambrecht, and S. Reynaud, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 043811 (2003).
- [14] V. B. Bezerra, G. L. Klimchitskaya and C. Romero, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 012111 (2001).
- [15] L. D. Landau, E. M. Lifshitz and L. P. Pitaevskii *Electrodynamics of Continuous Media*, (Pergamon Press, N. Y. , 1984).
- [16] J. A. Stratton, *Electromagnetic Theory*, (McGraw-Hill, N. Y. 1941).
- [17] P. Halevi, *Photonic Probes of Surfaces*, (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995); *Spatial Dispersion in Solids and Plasmas*, Electromagnetic Waves Vol. 1, ed. by P. Halevi (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1992).

- [18] For an example of a nontrivial application of the surface impedance to non-local excitonic semiconductor superlattices see G. H. Coccoletzi and W. Luis Mochán, Phys. Rev. B **39**, 8403 (1989).
- [19] G. Plunien, B. Müller and W. Greiner, Phys. Rep. **134**, 87 (1986).
- [20] E. López Olazagasti, G. H. Coccoletzi and W. L. Mochán, Solid State Comm. **78**, 9 (1991).
- [21] M. Born and E. Wolf, *Principles of Optics*, (Pergamon Press, 1980).
- [22] W. L. Mochán, M. del Castillo-Mussot and R. G. Barrera, Phys. Rev. B **35**, 1088 (1987).
- [23] G. Barton, Rep. Prog. Phys. **42**, 65 (1979).
- [24] M. G. Cottam and D. R. Tilley, *Introduction to Surface and Superlattice Excitations*, (Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- [25] N. W. Ashcroft and N. D. Mermin, *Solid State Physics*, (W. B. Saunders Company, 1976.)

FIG. 1: Schematics of the system used in our calculations. For the nonlocal case, the slab has an additional longitudinal field as shown in the Figure.

FIG. 2: Percent difference between the Casimir force when local and nonlocal effects are considered. The separation between the slabs is in units of the plasma wavelength λ_p of the metals. The curves correspond to Au, Al and K. The horizontal line is a visual aid to show where the percent difference is 1%.